

## The Scandal of War

REV. JOSEPH KEATING, S.J.

*An article by the editor of the Month (London). Reprinted from its issue of April, 1933.*

**I**F war—the organized mutual slaughter of millions of rational beings, because they cannot find in reason the means and motives for mutual agreement—is ever to cease to scandalize mankind, that happy result will be mainly due to the Catholic Church. That the scandal has not already disappeared is unhappily due to the failure of Catholics to realize the meaning of their faith and so to put it into practice. For the Church is now world-wide, the only body which is essentially supra-national, which commands the willing allegiance of heart and mind and which is united by bonds stronger in themselves than those of race or nationality. Moreover, the Church's teaching about war is substantially clear, consistent, unchanging and peremptory. And the Church's chief commandments, in the spirit of which her children should live, are—"Thou shalt love thy God . . . and thy neighbor as thyself." All true Christians have indeed this compelling motive to shun war, but because the Church's moral teaching is plain and undisputed, Catholics alone have the means of thinking aright and thinking alike on this momentous subject.

Unjust war is deliberate and systematized mass-murder, —one of the chief sins "crying to Heaven for vengeance." The guilt of that heinous crime attaches to those who bring it about and to all who encourage or excuse them. The injustice of war arises from its being waged in support of claims which are not really sound or only doubtfully so; or in support of just claims which can be otherwise secured, or are not in any way proportionate to the evils which war causes; or to its being waged by sinful means; or engaged in on private initiative; or prolonged after rights have been secured. These vitiating causes may combine in varying proportion to heighten the injustice in any particular case,

but the presence of one is enough to turn legitimate self-defence—the only moral justification for war—into mere murder.

It follows, since a mistake would lead to consequences so appallingly criminal, that not only those who declare war must be certain that their cause is just and their fighting necessary, but also those who sympathize with them or support them in any way, morally or materially, or who, in similar fashion, actively oppose their rivals, must be reasonably certain on which side right lies. No conscientious Christian can run the risk of upholding an unjust quarrel or frustrating a just one. Moreover, since even a just war brings such inevitable and vast calamities in its train, to ridicule or scoff at or impede the efforts made by the common sense of mankind to substitute for war peaceful methods of adjusting differences, is in its degree to share in the guilt of its continuance. In fact, it is the duty of those who have well-instructed consciences—as all Catholics may be presumed to have—to follow the lead of the Church speaking through their spiritual guides, in fostering the international reign of law, and the various institutions—Courts, Leagues and Pacts—designed to give it substance and vigor. Enlightened criticism, having for aim the improvement and strengthening of these institutions, is useful and praiseworthy, but to belittle them in the interests of a narrow nationalism, to rejoice at their defects and to work for their abandonment, is to be false to the spirit and teaching of the Faith. It is not a little significant that those secular influences in the Press which, out of a mistaken nationalism, are hostile to the League of Nations, are loud in their support of Japan in her present reactionary policy of independence.

It is the sense of human brotherhood, realized so remarkably within the fold of the Church, that prompts her zealous missionaries to spend health and life amongst the heathen, that all may be thus united. Our membership of Christ's Mystical Body is so real that every sundering influence, whether of age or race or condition, should be wholly discounted and ignored. Political alliances, the harmonizing of interests, friendly international coöperation of every sort, provide so many ways of approach to this Christian ideal, and those who decry any attempt to establish on a peaceful footing the community of nations are fighting

against the purposes of God as declared by His Church. In this periodical at the end of last year on the eve of the inauguration of the Disarmament Conference, appeared a summary of the various influences, emanating mostly from the passions of pride and fear, which, directly or indirectly, aim at thwarting it. The Catholic forces, and the efforts of peace-lovers generally, have not yet prevailed against those powerful passions, which, uncontrolled by reason, are threatening our ruin, and the Disarmament Conference, on which the hopes of the world were fixed seems to be hastening to an inglorious and ineffective end. Catholics, knowing the truth, have, nevertheless, not been able to organize their convictions, or in many cases, have not shown themselves any better instructed than those who have not their lights, and the reluctance, on the part of the chief Powers, to seek security and peace through a drastic measure of disarmament, has made the Conference, so far, abortive. The scandal of the war-mind persists.

The League of Nations, which many people blame as if it were a self-existent, independent entity, is simply an assembly of the Powers, not yet complete as regards number, not yet harmonious as regards purpose. It has only that amount of effectiveness that its constituents allow it at the moment. If they were united it could do wonders; in proportion to their divergences is it inoperative. They are not united because they do not realize that what they can achieve by union,—security, justice, peace—would be far more profitable to each than any sectional advantage they are severally seeking for. They are not united, because the peoples whose views they reflect regard “foreigners” as strangers, if not as enemies, not to be trusted, not to be helped, to be envied if prosperous, to be exploited if weak, to be shut out, if possible, from the material goods of earth, and finally as animated by similar sentiments towards themselves. To those who note the unrestrained national conceit and covetousness, manifested freely in the secular Press of each country, the marvel is that the League of Nations has not perished long ago, as it assuredly will perish, ultimately, unless nationalism is brought under the control of the Christian ideal of brotherhood. And that, I repeat, is preëminently the task and the duty of the members of the one supra-national Church.

The recent history of the League seems to show that a basis of common secular interests, for the most part as yet in the future, does not form a sufficiently stable foundation for mutual harmony. The League originally owed its existence to a vivid appreciation of the scandal of war, the ruin it brings even to the victors, and to a determination that mankind should never again be exposed to such an experience. Unfortunately, as generations pass away, the keenness of this realization and this purpose passes too. The militarists of every nation are becoming more and more vocal and are provoking less reaction. There is a danger lest, instead of growing stronger as it grows older, the League will lose influence, until it succumbs to the blind, disruptive tendencies of resurgent nationalism which denies human brotherhood and, in the event, the supremacy of the moral law. Already Japan, or rather her present military oligarchy, has chosen to withdraw from the League rather than pursue her claims in accordance with the rules of its Covenant and various supplementary Pacts. She has definitely rejected the obligations of world-solidarity which, on the other hand, the United States, not to say Soviet Russia, have never fully accepted.<sup>1</sup> The one main benefit derived from the sacrifice of ten million lives and untold wealth, is in danger of being entirely lost, because having won the war, the victors had not the wisdom and the restraint to consolidate the peace on the lines of justice, and because one of the five or six great Powers, which can make or mar international peace, has chosen, under trial, to act in isolation. It is an express and open-eyed and most unfortunate reversion to the pre-war mentality, when every nation, that had the power, tried to assert and enforce its own interests without regard to the common welfare, and, unless the resentment of the other nations at the scandal is shown in some unmistakable way, it is difficult to see how the League, as an effective organization for peace, can survive. Its main principles are common acceptance of the ideal of world-peace and collective responsibility for its maintenance. If that responsibility is exercised only in the case of small States, like the excitable and remote republics of South America; if any great Power can repudiate the ideal and "get away with it" in

<sup>1</sup>Both these Powers, however, by subscribing the Kellogg Pact, have agreed to banish War from international dealing.

its defiance without any untoward consequences, the League will suffer such a loss of prestige that nations will seek in other forms of alliance the security it can no longer guarantee. It must either maintain the moral principles which are its soul, or sink into decline.

The Lytton Report on the Manchurian quarrel, presented to the League on October 2, raised the hopes of the world. Here was an impartial judicial Commission, after trying every means of conciliation for months, and giving a patient hearing on the spot to the aggrieved parties, issuing a decision which, while admitting and safeguarding the rights of Japan, defended the cardinal point of the sovereignty of China, and suggested measures which would re-establish good relations and prevent any return of the unsatisfactory and provocative *status quo*. A Special Committee of the League duly discussed the Report, made eleventh-hour efforts at conciliation and finally presented its conclusions, which were in sum a complete endorsement of its Committee's findings, to the Assembly on February 21. They were unanimously adopted on February 24, which means that forty-two nations (the Latin-American States were not present) including all the members of the Council, declared Japan to have violated her engagements under the Covenant. Unfortunately, that instrument does not define what penalties attach to such a violation. All that the League is bound to do under Article XV. § 4 is to publish "the recommendations which are deemed just and proper." These recommendations are, so far, mainly negative. Members of the League are urged not to do anything inconsistent with the findings of the Report, particularly not to recognize the Japanese "State" of Manchukuo nor any such territorial adjustments accomplished by force. A Negotiation Committee on which America and Soviet Russia are invited to serve, is to be set up if the Report is finally accepted, to endeavor to effect a settlement of the dispute in such a way as to preserve the rights of both parties.

Unanimity so far and to this limited extent. Here comes the scandal. None of these States, that have had the courage to condemn this great Eastern Power for the lawless use of armed force, has the courage—or shall we say, the means?—to forbid their own nationals to supply her with war-materials. An attempt was made, to its credit, by

Great Britain, which declared an interim arms-embargo in regard to both belligerents on February 27, only to remove it a fortnight later, after having tried in vain to induce the other manufacturing countries to unite in the prohibition. Apparently one and all refused, even though the embargo respected existing contracts—and doubtless such were framed for just a contingency of the sort—and did not exclude raw materials. The world's sense of decency and congruity called for an embargo—"It is unseemly," said *The Times* (February 25), "for a country which is a member of the League and stands by its principles to despatch weapons for the use of a State which is defying the League. . . . It would be abhorrent to the public conscience that arms should be freely exported to a covenant-breaking State." Yet Sir John Simon, when announcing the embargo, assured the House—and Japan—that in no circumstances would this country enforce the decree at the risk of war, and Mr. Baldwin, announcing its removal, said that it served "no useful purpose." No details were given of the negotiations to secure combined action: we were not told what States were obdurate and why; but what emerges from the whole futile proceeding is the terrible fact that the armament-firms are at present too powerful to be controlled, that the ramifications of the war-industry are so widespread and influential that united political action in restraint of them is not possible!<sup>2</sup>

Herein lies the weakness of the League, and thus is revealed why the Disarmament Conference has been so far abortive. The financial interests involved in the maintenance of war are so vast, so widespread and so impersonal, that until they are in some way diverted into other channels, war, and the preparations for war, will go on. In no way has the abuse of capital in unproductive enterprise, condemned implicitly by the Pope,<sup>3</sup> shown itself more prevalent and more disastrous than in the vast sums devoted to the production of war materials. Consider the paradox: a world

<sup>2</sup>This country is the chief maker and exporter of war-goods, its trade in 1925 amounting to £5,400,000, 35.5 per cent of the world's trade, whilst U. S. A. came next with 22.5 per cent (£2,140,000). But France's war-trade is looking up, for it has jumped from 79,000,000 francs in 1931 to 244,000,000 francs in 1932.

<sup>3</sup>"The investment of superfluous income in securing favorable opportunities for employment, provided the labor employed produces results which are really useful, is to be considered an act of real liberality, particularly appropriate to the needs of our time." "Quadragesimo Anno" (C. T. S.), p. 24.

struggling to recover from the unparalleled ravages of an almost universal war and longing for the establishment of brotherhood and peace, and in the midst of it a colossal industry which demands for its success the continuance and increase of warfare! Urged by the fear of lowered dividends and lost capital those interested in that industry must almost instinctively oppose the cutting down of munition-making which forms their livelihood. And because national self-defence against unjust aggression—the only occasion, we repeat, in which fighting is morally lawful—may still, at times, be called for, until the several nations have the sense to make their League really effective, these private armament-firms, providing the means of legitimate self-defence, are, in themselves, lawful. This is the real reason why the nations will not disarm—and here, of course, I speak only of those four or five great industrial Powers whose command of raw materials—coal, iron, steel, nitrates, oil, cotton—makes them also great military Powers; too many of their subjects have an interest in the continuance and growth of belligerency. The natural energizing of an ill-regulated and avaricious capitalism is always seeking private and immediate profit to the oblivion of the common good. War is too profitable to these individuals to be readily abandoned. Unless and until the nations succeed in eliminating the element of private gain from munition-making, war will go on—nay, as business is always seeking greater profits and wider fields of operation, the war-spirit, the atmosphere in which that business flourishes, will be constantly stimulated for business ends. The War-Trade has this advantage over all others that an order received from one nation means subsequent orders from all its competitors. But, like less fortunate trades, it must also advertise and solicit custom. And one need not be a cynic to surmise that the designs of a State ordering newer and better equipment are never scrutinized with care lest the trader should be coöperating with injustice. People have not forgotten the notorious Mr. Shearer whom three great American armament-firms sent to Geneva to throw all the sand he could into the workings of the Naval Limitation Conference there. Mammon knows no national allegiance. During the war, French firms supplied Germany with chemicals for explosives and German firms supplied France with magnetos for aeroplanes, through neutral Swit-



zerland<sup>4</sup> and, according to Admiral Consett, British firms supplied war-goods to Germany through Denmark during the war. And after the Great War, it was the French who armed the Turks and the British who armed the Greeks for that short but savage campaign which undid some of its good effects. So little do considerations of morality enter into trade.

It is here, plainly, that Christian action should intervene to prevent or check what, for all the agents know or care, may be connivance in murder for the sake of money-gain. As in Christian teaching, which has become more detailed and precise in recent times, the conditions under which war is justifiable are now hardly imaginable, first because of its unparalleled physical atrocity and of the vast moral evils inseparably accompanying it; secondly because all the States of the world, almost without exception,<sup>5</sup> have, with the approval of their peoples, renounced war as an instrument of policy and promised to settle all their disputes of whatever kind by pacific means; and thirdly because, in the League itself, and in the World Court of International Justice, those means are now provided,—for these reasons it should be a matter of conscience with a Catholic whether or not he is connected, directly at least, with the armaments-trade, which, in its present dimensions and as now conducted, is an anachronism and a scandal in a world which has renounced war. I say "directly" because often, unhappily, the same goods may, with or without much alteration, serve for peace as well as for war, and the worker or the shareholder may not know for which he is providing.<sup>6</sup>

But more important than financial or manual concurrence in war-manufactures, is the question of the moral support of war itself by instructed Catholics or, what is much the same thing, active opposition to the modern peace-movement. I know that that cause counts amongst its followers—just as that other moral reform called the Temperance movement—a number of people whose motives or whose methods Catholic morality cannot approve: pacifists, communists, mere cowards, who misinterpret both the Gospel teaching and the dictates of common sense. That is all the

<sup>4</sup>See "The Character of a New War," Gollancz (1933), pp. 199-200.

<sup>5</sup>Brazil is the only State of consequence that has stood aloof.

<sup>6</sup>An American investigator has drawn up a list of 3,876 peace-products which in case of war would count as contraband!



more reason why Catholics should join to keep the movement on sound lines, for no results can be permanent or healthy which contradict right reason. Maintaining, therefore, the essential truth that every nation has a right to defend, if necessary by force, its independence<sup>7</sup> and its integrity, Catholics should, in the spirit of their religion, do all they can to break down national antagonism and all that assertion of national interests which ignores the common good. Even apart from the Church we are now members of an international society which has claims on our love and service. We have a right to peace and order in that society. Whether, in view of the Kellogg Pact, we would be justified, outside the case of defence against aggression, in refusing to support our Government in war, I have discussed, without coming to a very definite conclusion, in a previous article.<sup>8</sup> But I venture to think that not only Catholics but all Christians will, henceforward, scrutinize more closely the policies of their several countries which seem to contemplate war, lest they should be guilty of injustice. And it would be well if our catechetical instructions laid greater emphasis upon the clear guidance we, above all others, enjoy in this grave matter, for living in a non-Catholic State we are always exposed to acquiescence in legislation and political aims which, unwittingly perhaps, do not square with morality.

It is significant and encouraging that many Catholic Bishops and theologians on the Continent have lately taken occasion of the bellicose nationalism which they encounter to reiterate and clarify the Church's doctrine on this subject. It is always a delicate matter for Catholic ecclesiastics, exposed so frequently to the intolerance of the secular State, to give decisions which must contradict the pretensions of Cæsarism. They have often to choose between two evils—that of being silent and that of provoking by speech some new infringement of the Church's rights. However, both in Germany and France, countries wherein nationalist excesses are most rife, the Catholic teaching has been courageously proclaimed, as it were in preparation for the Holy Year.

<sup>7</sup>That modified independence which is all that various modern forms of interdependence—economic, social, financial—allow. There is no such thing as absolute sovereignty. Indeed as long as the practice of war persists, every State which has to look to another for the material means of self-defence is to that extent a vassal. From such tutelage membership of an effective and comprehensive League of Nations would set it free.

<sup>8</sup>See "Cæsarism, Conscience and War," the *Month*, July, 1932.

And, indeed, the new circumstances created by the World War and its repercussions call for a fuller statement by Catholic theologians *de jure belli et pacis*; wherefore various annual gatherings and "semaines" *ad hoc* have resulted in a marked development of doctrine, of which moralists must, henceforth, take account. The two last yearly meetings at Geneva organized by the "Union Catholique d'Etudes Internationales" had for subjects "The League of Nations" and "Moral Disarmament" respectively, and stressed both the reality of the international community to which all owe a degree of allegiance, and the necessity of including, in working for peace, national harmony as well as international. The inseparable character of these two aims—the suppression of class-war as well as of the wider form of belligerency—was also emphasized in the appeal for unity and peace made by the French hierarchy in October, 1931, and echoed later in London by our own Cardinal Archbishop. The fomenter of discord between Capital and Labor, and the rancorous political partisan, offend the spirit of Christian peace.

An even more formal disquisition on the moral bearings of war was issued in that October by a committee of theologians, Swiss, French and German, who had considered the question in the light of modern international developments. Their conclusion was in brief that the interdependence of the world is now such that it is the *duty* of the several States to develop, for the stabilization of world-peace, appropriate political, juridical and economic institutions, and, moreover, that it is the duty and right of the individual to exert himself through the same means for the same end. In other words, in the view of these grave men, the international society, though not fully evolved, has arrived, and we all have become cosmopolitans as well as citizens of our particular States. War, therefore, becomes a breach of international order of which everyone may rightly complain, just as the individual may complain of a street-quarrel which disturbs civic peace. As citizens of the world we must support whatever world-institutions already exist for the ordering of the world, whilst trying to perfect them, for we have now a right to be made safe from the evil of war. And, in relation to our fellow world-citizens, we must be concerned lest, on the strength of an alleged mission of domination confided to one or other race, their national rights are ignored.

Such is the reasoned conclusion of these Catholic theologians, who include such well-known names as Father Stratmann, O.P., and Father Valensin, S.J. Even more authority attaches to a doctrinal program issued by the Faculty of Philosophy of the Catholic University of Paris in 1930 which contains an important chapter (Propositions 418 to 447) dealing with International Morality. Of this the purport, judging by an interesting account of it given by Père de la Brière in *Etudes* (February 5), is that absolute nationalism—what we usually call Caesarism—is immoral, since national interests should always take account of, and be conditioned by, God's rights, by the moral law, by the rights of other nations, and the rights, not State-conferred, of individual citizens. Our readers may remember somewhat similar conclusions, detailed in a statement in *The Month* for January of last year on "The Place of Nationality in the Law of Nations," which statement had been elaborated by the "Union Catholique d'Etudes Internationales." If, as is generally supposed, the next General Council will define in detail the Catholic doctrine on Peace and War, it must be owned that the ground for discussion is being well prepared. Want of space prevents quotations from various members of the *Ecclesia Docens*, who, in Germany, Austria, Italy and France, have followed Papal lead in urging disarmament and peace, but an utterance of Cardinal von Faulhaber of Munich deserves special mention. His Eminence said, just before the opening of the Disarmament Conference, that—"the after-effects of a modern war are so dreadful that they are out of all proportion with the national good which war is meant to preserve or gain . . . the conditions which make war legitimate have become much more rare than heretofore, since today a war grievously unsettles the economy of the whole world." Hence war is an anachronism, a relic of barbarism, a reproach to a community which has other and better ways of securing order.

Naturally, the Hitlerites in Germany, the *Action Française* in France, and militarists everywhere have resented this clear Christian teaching. Even Catholics across the Channel seem to have been somewhat divided in sentiment and the French Episcopate, and more specifically Cardinal Liénart of Lille, have had to intervene to prevent Catholic teaching from being either exaggerated or minimized. They

insist that true patriotism and just nationalism find their strongest support in the Church, but that neither calls for any mitigation of Christ's clear command that His followers should love even their enemies. After all, by promoting peace and brotherhood, and opposing the scandal of war, one best serves one's country in these days.

These Catholic discussions and controversies suggest one, perhaps venturesome, desire. The Holy Father, whose magnificent Encyclicals on Christian Unity, Marriage, Education, the Social Question and Catholic Action, have done so much to instruct and direct and steady Catholic public opinion, would delight his faithful children beyond measure, were he to find occasion in this Holy Year to declare fully the mind of the Church in regard to Peace. His "intentions," for which the world of pilgrims will be praying, include "the salvation of all mankind led astray by so many errors, so torn asunder by discord and hostility, laboring under so many miseries, and fearful of so many dangers." There is no greater source of fear than the menace of war, no more widespread error than that arms create security, no more prolific cause of discord than injustice enforced by war or the threat of it. From all this a whole-hearted and united profession of Catholicism, inspired by the Vicar of Christ the King, is by far the most likely way to set the world free.

## **The Basic Issue in Recognition of Soviet Russia**

REV. EDMUND A. WALSH, S.J.

*An address at a mass meeting to protest against recognition. The meeting was held in Washington, April 18, under the auspices of the American Legion and 150 participating organizations.*

**R**ECOGNITION of the Soviet Union ultimately and basically is not a question of repudiated debts or confiscated property or Communists on soap boxes in Union Square, as that distinguished tribune of the people, Mr. Alfred E. Smith, visualizes the problem in his recent state-

ment advocating recognition of the Moscow government. Mr. Smith exercises a well-merited influence and his opinions on domestic policies command the confidence of a very wide constituency of Catholics, Protestants, and Jews. But I feel obligated to make clear to you, in a very limited time, why his Russian views are not shared by so many American citizens of his own Faith who see eye to eye with him in most other respects.

Two civilizations diametrically opposed in their principles, their practices, and their objectives come face to face before the supreme tribunal of public opinion in a manner that has no precedent in international relations. The form of government which Soviet Russia would impose by force on the entire world is too well known to need rehearsal here. Suffice it to say that it proposes, as a government policy, to abolish universally every shred of the democratic ideal embodied in the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution of the United States, and the Bill of Rights. That is the plain meaning of Section 1, paragraph 9, of the Soviet Constitution which affirms that what has been accomplished in Russia is a "decisive step towards the union of the toilers of all countries into one World Soviet Socialist Republic." Paragraph 7, same section, declares Soviet jurisdiction to be "international in its class character." Article 72 of that same Constitution—not article 72 of the Communist Party nor the reiterated articles of provocation sponsored by exuberant individual Communists—but Article 72 of the organic law of a sovereign state provides in judicial language that the capital of this contemplated Socialist League of Nations shall be the city of Moscow. And further specific pronouncements by responsible Soviet officials explains that this conquest of all non-Communist states is to be achieved by force of arms. Moscow is not content to live and let live.

Nor is this hostility merely academic or theoretical. It has been reduced to concrete form in the two practical agencies which the Communist party of Russia created after the second Russian revolution. The domestic instrument contrived to ensure the permanency of Marxian Communism on Russian soil is called the Soviet government, which becomes thereby, in Mr. Zinoviev's celebrated phrase, a sort of fifth wheel. The external apparatus for the conquest of the non-Communist world is called the Third International.

Both are the direct creations and active agents of the political bureau of the Communist party. These two agencies of world revolution are, in the words of Ramsay MacDonald, "organically connected." The nations of the world have refused to accept the stale pretext that the Third International is a private organization over which the Soviet government has no control. It is not a private organization and never was. It was founded by responsible officials of the Soviet government while holding office, was convoked by the official Soviet telegraph agency, its first meetings were held in a government building within the Kremlin and its revolutionary program published in the official state organ, *Izvestia*, on January 24, 1919. Its subversive activities, from that date to this, are matter of public record.

We have never questioned nor do we now question the right of the Russia people to set up any form of government they see fit to endure. All such accusations are either sheer ignorance or malicious attempts to deceive the simple minded. We were the first nation in the world to recognize the Russian revolution by extending full diplomatic recognition to the new government on March 22, 1917, one week after the abdication of Nicholas II. What we do question and refuse to tolerate is the insupportable arrogance of the Communist party which came into power on November 7, 1918, and which assumes to dictate to us the form of government we shall have in these United States. Our motive is not fear, which is the only justification some advocates of recognition can find for our present policy. The motive is self-respect and a decent regard for sovereignty under international law.

Rightly then, has the government of the United States refused to compromise with those two allied agencies—the Soviet government and the Third International, refuses categorically and without reservation for the very reasons once advanced by a distinguished American lawyer trying a case of conspiracy. He argued that in any common pact directed against public security the act of one member is the act of all and the guilt of all is the guilt of each after the conspiracy is formed. "In other words," he explained to the jury, "if you and I join together for the doing of an unlawful act, the fact that you may remain ten miles away while I go and commit the crime, does not relieve you either legally or

morally or exempt you from punishment." So argued Senator William E. Borah when he so ably defended the people of his state against organized lawlessness at Wallace, Idaho, on July 27, 1899—and won his case. He has since become the most outstanding advocate of recognition.

With his habitual disregard for the actualities in the case, Senator Borah made another speech in the Senate on April 11 this year in which he assured that body that he had made extensive research into the question of Soviet hostility to the United States and was able to report:

that there has never been since Mr. Stalin became dictator of the Russian government any attempt whatever upon the part of the Soviet republic to interfere with the governmental affairs of the United States or to seek by propaganda to interfere with the governmental affairs of this country. . . . In my opinion, the charge that the Soviet government is seeking to undermine or destroy our government is an exploded and absurd proposition.

I greatly fear that the investigations of the distinguished Senator must have been interrupted by a roll call. He overlooked the easily ascertained fact that on May 6, 1929, there was held in Moscow a meeting of the so-called "American Commission of the Third International." Mr. Stalin pointed out at great length to the visiting delegates from the United States, the most efficacious means for drawing revolutionary profit from the prevailing economic crisis in their home land. In other words, the ruler of the Soviet government, while encouraging his American agents in their use of purring platitudes and honeyed phrases calculated to obtain diplomatic recognition of the Soviet Union, drops the mask in Moscow and instructs his American visitors thus:

I think, comrades, that the American Communist party is one of those few Communist parties in the world upon which history has conferred a task of a decisive character from the viewpoint of the world revolutionary movement. . . . The crisis of world capitalism is developing at an increased speed and is bound to extend also to American capitalism. . . . It is necessary that the American Communist party should be able to meet this historical moment fully armed, and to take the lead in the coming class battles in America. . . . With this end in view the American Communist party must be improved and Bolshevized. . . . With this end in view we must strain our efforts to forge genuinely revolutionary groups and genuinely revolutionary leaders of the proletariat who would be able to lead the many millions of the American labor classes into the revolutionary class battles."



This speech, suppressed for some time, was published in Moscow on January 15, 1930, long after Mr. Stalin became dictator of Soviet Russia. If that be a simple of Mr. Borah's capacity for research, I know of no reputable university that would award him a Ph.D. on it. And in common with many other incomplete thinkers he appeals to the historic precedent that we recognized the French revolution despite the inflammatory language and internationalism of its leaders. Similarly, the argument is often advanced that we recognized the Russian tzars, recognized the Turks, Mussolini, and Hitler, despite the fact that we are utterly opposed to many of the political ideals and practices of their respective systems. Gentlemen, these are partial statements and the lie that is half a truth is the hardest lie to combat. Recognitionists who press this argument are either uninformed or malicious. They suppress the vitally important fact that none of these foreign powers has set up in its capital city an organization for the purpose of overthrowing foreign governments; their leaders launch no invitation to nationals of other countries to wage civil war against the authorities of their respective lands; none of these powers has so flagrantly offended international friendship that its ministers and ambassadors have been expelled from numerous states whose patience and long suffering became exhausted. When Citizen Genet anticipated some of the forms of Soviet diplomacy in 1794 he was promptly withdrawn by the French revolutionary government on demand of Washington. And should Mr. Mussolini or Mr. Hitler conduct their international relations as Mr. Stalin does, I am confident they would meet the same reception here that Mr. Stalin's government has met for fifteen years.

And in his peroration, Senator Borah made an appeal not to isolate Russia any longer, but to admit her to our councils as a contribution to international peace. But who built that Chinese wall, to which the recognitionists love to point, if not Russia herself by her wanton disrespect and contempt for international friendship? Nothing keeps her inside her self-imposed isolation except her highly-cultivated, hysterical sense of martyrdom and her own perverse will which refuses to observe the most elementary rules of international decency. Let her check her razors at the door and she will be admitted to the party.

It has been argued, too, that the presence of an American ambassador in Moscow will tend to mollify Soviet excesses and give diplomacy a chance to restrain the unruly Commissars. Ask the British ambassador about that as he departs from Moscow after the premeditated insult flung into his teeth with reverse English, so to speak, that it might be sure to rebound into the face of a third foreign power for good measure. You will recall that Sir Esmond Ovey was recently informed by the Soviet Commissar of Foreign Affairs that he must not imagine he was in a place like Mexico. And ask Mexico herself why she withdrew her minister from Moscow in 1929, and severed diplomatic relations. Ask the French government how Soviet ambassadors observe international courtesy. They were obliged to expel Mr. Rakovsky from Paris for launching an appeal, while Ambassador to France, counselling the French army to rise in mutiny against their officers. Ask China why she expelled Karakhan, Soviet representative in 1926, and what she found when she raided the quarters of the Soviet legation!

But there are some in our midst who would sacrifice self-respect and public welfare in the sacred name of hypothetical trade and dubious export possibilities. Take the cash, they murmur, and let the credit go. Money has no odor, and sweet is the music of falling shekels. Even on that shamefully mercenary basis of private profit the argument still remains fallacious and puerile. In the one year of 1930, Soviet Russia purchased enormous supplies in this country, amounting to \$114,300,000, and that was done without recognition. Lack of recognition is no bar to trade. And recognition does not guarantee increase of trade. Her purchases have now dwindled to almost nothing simply because American banks grew alarmed about her heavy commitments and withdrew credit facilities. In reprisal, the Soviet government transferred its purchases to Germany, as it always can do in virtue of its foreign trade monopoly, which is used as a political weapon to punish the nationals of any country that annoys Moscow's tender susceptibilities. I might observe in passing that Mr. Smith's description of American trade with Russia as being carried on "under cover" is, of course, a pure figure of speech or else unmitigated nonsense. It was and is the most open business on Broadway. It has never been prohibited by anybody.

And how shall Moscow pay for that mirage of exports from our factories which the recognitionists conjure out of their distorted imagination? In cash? She has none. She is hopelessly bankrupt. She is distrusted by the loaning powers whose memory of her wholesale repudiation of previous loans is still green. She is faced with domestic starvation, compromised internally by the unfulfilled promises of a fantastic Five-Year Plan, and reduced again to the sorry expedient of finding public scapegoats in sensational trials of foreign engineers who have been terrorized into making alleged confessions of economic espionage. Or, she can pay in goods by dumping the monopolized products of her forced labor into the free markets of America, there to depress instead of raising commodity prices. Ask the American Federation of Labor what that would do to the few jobs left for the American workman or the American farmer, and if they intend to submit tamely to it!

Therefore the alleged trade must be financed by new credits advanced by the banks and financiers who, as usual, will profit handsomely by this new raid on the people's hard-earned savings. If we may believe recent revelations, these philanthropists rarely use their own money for the flotation of foreign loans. It has been noted that the trade proposal, involving an extension of credit or a peddling of Russian bonds, is warmly advocated in those very financial circles which have forfeited the right to dictate public policy any longer. They had their heyday—and what a heyday it was! They were publicly scourged as convicted malefactors by President Roosevelt in his courageous inaugural address when he said:

Faced by failure of credit they have proposed only the lending of more money. Stripped of the lure of profit by which to induce our people to follow their false leadership they have resorted to exhortations, pleading tearfully for restored confidence. They know only the rules of a generation of self-seekers. They have no vision, and when there is no vision the people perish. The money changers have fled from their high seats in the temple of our civilization. We may now restore that temple to the ancient truths. The measure of the restoration lies in the extent to which we apply social values more noble than mere monetary profit.

You will note too, that those who clamor for an official trade agreement are strangely silent about the experiences of gov-

ernments which have made such pacts. Why has Italy terminated her trade agreement? Because it proved wholly unsatisfactory and contrary to Italian expectations. Why did England, long before the present controversy, denounce her trade agreement? Because it proved harmful to the best interests of the British Commonwealth of Nations. These valuable experiences are ignored by those who would plunge us into the same unprofitable speculation. They ask us to accept an emasculated tragedy of Hamlet with no mention made of the Prince of Denmark. There are two ways of acquiring political wisdom—by foresight and by hindsight. Which shall we choose? And shall we listen to the insane proposals to appropriate millions for Russian trade from government funds at a moment when thirteen-million Americans are in danger of starvation while other millions of farmers and tenants are faced with foreclosure and eviction through lack of means to succor them! . . .

Ladies and Gentlemen: Recognition is an act of national political expediency. There is no juridical right to recognition and no legal or moral obligation to recognize. In the present case there are positive grounds for refusing to recognize. American policy and practice have been governed by two considerations clearly set forth by that eminent jurist John Basset Moore in his monumental "International Law Digest":

(1) That the government seeking recognition shall be in *de facto* possession and control of the territory over which it claims jurisdiction without substantial revolt or opposition on the part of its population. We do not demand legitimacy of succession, nor do we inquire into the validity of the possessor's title.

(2) That the government in question shall be able and willing to perform its international obligations and conform to the usages accepted by the civilized nations of the world. Failure to conform to these obligations is cited by Judge Moore as sufficient grounds for refusing recognition.

That the present Soviet government fulfills the first requirement is not questioned. That it still does not and will not accept that reasonable second requirement is matter of public record. Therefore, it seems to me that three courses are open to the government of the United States. The first would be honorable recognition. By that I mean reciprocal diplomatic relations after proof of Moscow's willingness to

desist from the unethical, the illegal and utterly unacceptable hostility to non-Communist states which has been her undeniable practice heretofore. Written guarantees are useless. I say *proof* of such desisting, not *promises*. They have been consistently violated as he who cares may read, and no new facts are available to indicate a change of essential policy in that regard. The acid test of Moscow's sincerity lies in her willingness or refusal to banish the Third International from her territory, disassociate herself from the offensive international conspiracy to which she is now partner and respect the inalienable sovereign rights of other nations and governments. This should be accomplished before, not after, recognition, when the rose would have been plucked. An unparalleled opportunity lies before us for a magnificent service to peace and neighborly conduct among nations by vindicating the sanctity of international good manners to which President Roosevelt has definitely pledged his administration. If we default in that clear duty we shall have forfeited the respect of the world whose eyes are watching what we are about to do with our unique bargaining power. We have a manifest appointment with Opportunity that may make history. God grant that we be not in conference with the money-changers when she knocks.

The second course is the reverse of the first. It would be dishonorable recognition, by which I mean acceptance of Soviet Russia's terms, which are:—Recognize us as we are with no conditions or reservations except the guarantee of a substantial loan and with full scope for our particular form of international friendship. What that is you will find in the writings of Lenin and in the record of our dealings with other governments.

The third course would be simply continued non-recognition as America's answer to the continuance, under Soviet auspices and direction, of the Third International. That is the logical consequence of America's traditional recognition policy. The burden of the proof and the first step to friendship rests with Moscow. No commission to Russia or round-table conference is needed for that. She opened the breach. She is continuing the breach, and she alone can close it. Do not be misled by the subtle sophistry of pseudo-liberals, the emotionalism of the misinformed and the sordid propaganda of dollar chasers. . . .